

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	•			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,242	10/16/2001	Karthisha S. Canagasaby	42390P11916X	8029
23363	7590 04/24/2006		EXAMINER	
,	PARKER & HALE, LLP	LUU, CUONG V		
PO BOX 7068 PASADENA, CA 91109-7068				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2128	
			DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/982,242	CANAGASABY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Cuong V. Luu	2128				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.11 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute the state of the state of the state of the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ja This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accompanies applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The acth or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	wn from consideration. or election requirement. er. epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some colon None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-30 have been examined. Claims 1-30 have been rejected.

Response to Amendment

1. The amendments on the specification filed on 1/12/2006 have been considered and accepted.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/12/2006 see pp. 8, regarding double patenting rejections on claims 1-12, 14-16, and 28-30 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Filing a terminal disclaimer cannot be overcome the statutory type of double patenting.
- 3. Applicant's arguments, see pp. 8-9, filed on 1/12/2006, with respect to claims 1-30 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections of claims 1-30 have been withdrawn.
- 4. Applicant's arguments, see pp. 8-9, filed on 1/12/2006, with respect to claims 13 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph rejection of claim 13 has been withdrawn.
- 5. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/12/2006, see pp. 9-10, regarding claims 1, 15, and 23 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Weste et al, though do not explicitly state "test network", teach a network used for running simulation to obtain the effect of interconnected wire between a driver and a receiver. This network is functionally equivalent

Application/Control Number: 09/982,242

Art Unit: 2128

to the network the applicants claim as "test network". Claims 1, 15, and 23, therefore, remain

Page 3

rejected.

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/12/2006, see pp. 9-10, regarding claims 2-14 have been

fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 2-14 are argued allowable because

claim 1, which they depend on, is allowable. Since claim 1 stay rejected as discussed in

item 3, claims 2-14 remain rejected.

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/12/2006, see pp. 9-10, regarding claims 16-22 have been

fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 16-22 are argued allowable because

claim 15, which they depend on, is allowable. Since claim 15 stay rejected as discussed in

item 3, claims 16-22 remain rejected.

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/12/2006, see pp. 9-10, regarding claims 24-30 have been

fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 24-30 are argued allowable because

claim 23, which they depend on, is allowable. Since claim 23 stay rejected as discussed in

item 3, claims 24-30 remain rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly

claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claim 13 fails to correspond in scope with that which applicants regard as the invention can be found in the reply filed on 1/12/2006. In that paper, in claim 13 applicant has stated, "The capacitance is distributed gate capacitance", and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim because the invention is about interconnection. The capacitance in this claim is capacitance of interconnection between devices, a driver and a receiver, while gate capacitance is a capacitance of a transistor device, which is a portion of the receiver; technically and conventionally it cannot be considered a part of interconnection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatented by *Neil Weste et al (Principles of CMOS VLSI Design: A System Perspective, Second Edition, 1993, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company).

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 2128

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cuong V. Luu whose telephone number is 571-272-8572. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jean Homere, can be reached on (571)272-3780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. An inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Art Unit: 2128

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CVL '

KAMINI SHAH KAMINI SHAH KAMINI SHAH EXAMINER